R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 015 746 JC 670 958

PROFILE OF THE IDEAL COMMUNITY-JUNIOR COLLEGE.

BY- KINTZER, FREDERICK C.

PUB DATE 67

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$0.88 20P.

DESCRIPTORS- *JUNIOR COLLEGES, *COLLEGE ROLE, COMMUNITY COLLEGES, SCHOOL COMMUNITY RELATIONSHIP, TRANSFER PROGRAMS, GENERAL EDUCATION, STUDENT PERSONNEL SERVICES, OPEN ENROLLMENT, VOCATIONAL EDUCATION, REMEDIAL INSTRUCTION,

THREE BASIC PRINCIPLES HAVE CONTRIBUTED TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE COMMUNITY JUNIOR COLLEGE--(1) AN EXPANDED FREE EDUCATION FOR AN EXPANDING CITIZENRY, (2) GREATER DIVERSITY AND FLEXIBILITY IN EDUCATION, AND (3) EFFECTIVE ORGANIZATION AND SUBSTANTIAL FINANCIAL SUPPORT AT THE LOCAL LEVEL. IN STRIVING TOWARD ITS PRIME OBJECTIVE OF QUALITY PROGRAMS FOR A DIVERSIFIED STUDENT BODY, THE COMMUNITY-JUNIOR COLLEGE SHOULD (1) BE AVAILABLE TO ALL WHO MAY PROFIT FROM ITS PROGRAM, (2) PROVIDE GUIDANCE SERVICES TO ASSIST EACH STUDENT IN SELECTION OF A COURSE OF STUDY, (3) PROVIDE TECHNICAL-VOCATIONAL PROGRAMS GEARED TO COMMUNITY NEEDS, (4) OFFER QUALITY LOWER DIVISION TRANSFER PROGRAMS, (5) REQUIRE A MINIMUM GENERAL EDUCATION PROGRAM FOR ALL DEGREES OR CERTIFICATES, (6) RELATE TO AND SERVE ITS ENTIRE COMMUNITY, (7) PROVIDE REMEDIAL COURSES, (8) IN INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH, EMPHASIZE THE TEACHING PROCESS AND STUDENT SUCCESS, AND (9) MAINTAIN A HIGH QUALITY OF INSTRUCTION AS ITS MAJOR GOAL. THIS ARTICLE IS A REPRINT FROM "COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY," VOLUME 42, NUMBER 4, SUMMER 1967. (WO)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ERIC
UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

NOV 15 1967

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

ED015746

Reprinted from
College and University
Vol. 42, Summer 1967

What University and College Admissions Officers Should Know About Two-year Colleges

Chairman: EDWARD BUSH, Director of Admissions, Port Huron Junior College

Recorder: JOHN E. TOMPKINS, Director of Admissions, North Texas State University

Speaker: FREDERICK C. KINTZER, Associate Director, Office of Relations with Schools, University of California

Presentation by Mr. Kintzer

Profile of the Ideal Community-Junior College

THERE is no subject that I would rather be asked to discuss than the junior college. Most dynamic of all collegiate institutions, the community-junior college is emerging in explosive proportions on the higher education scene.

The importance of this diversified, flexible institution can hardly be overstated. In state after state, two year colleges are assuming an ever-increasing share of post high school students preparing for upper division studies or for more immediate entry into the world of work.

By 1975, it is predicted that as many as 6.5 million students will be enrolled in more than 1,000 publicly supported junior colleges. Even now, several states—including California, Florida, and New York—are approaching Eurich's dream for the twenty-first century: that a junior college will then be available for every young man and woman within commuting distance from home.[1]

My comments will be largely confined to public comprehensive junior colleges which, with increasing frequency these days, are being named community colleges. Specifically, I first propose to develop a philosophy—a rationale—for all two-year colleges, and then to present a brief discussion of nine propositions which outline functions of the comprehensive public junior college. Problems and issues commonly faced by these institutions are also indicated.

---

[1] Alvin C. Eurich, "Higher Education in the Twenty-First Century," *The Atlantic Monthly*, June, 1963.

JC670958

Rationale for community-junior colleges

The community-junior college conceived by American educators to meet the needs of post-high school education in the United States receives its nourishment from basic principles, planks, if you like, in American education. I refer to (1) *an expanded free education for an expanding citizenry,* (2) *greater diversity and flexibility in education to achieve the enormous task, and* (3) *effective organization and substantial financial support at the local level.*

Discussion of the first concept dominates the Report of the President's Commission on Higher Education:

> Education is by far the biggest and the most hopeful of the nation's enterprises. Long ago our people recognized that education for all is not only democracy's obligation but its necessity. Education is the foundation of democratic liberties, without an educated citizenry alert to preserve and extend freedom, it would not long endure.[2]

Although critics clash on questions of implementing this noble principle, there is general agreement that every American should have the opportunity to profit from experiences in higher education to the extent of his capacity.

The word "free" is not mine. The President's Commission speaks out strongly on equalizing individual opportunity:

> The importance of economic barriers to post-high school education lies in the fact that there is little if any relationship between the ability to benefit from a college education and the ability to pay for it. . . .
>
> By allowing the opportunity for higher education to depend largely on the individual's economic status, we are not only denying to millions of young people the chance in life to which they are entitled; we are also depriving the Nation of a vast amount of potential leadership and potential social competence which it sorely needs.[3]

With the phrase, "greater diversity and flexibility in education," we are referring to the need for a wide variety of collegiate institutions, both public and private, each with a capacity to adjust relatively rapidly to the changing needs of a particular community, each striving for excellence in its assigned role.

---

[2] *Higher Education for American Democracy: A Report of the President's Commission for Higher Education,* New York: Harper and Brothers, 1948, p. 8.

[3] *Ibid.,* p. 10.

Each type of two-year institution—the technical institute, the private church related school, the local public community college—if it is excellent in its own way, contributes to the total diversity needed in American higher education. "Such diversity," in the words of John Gardner, "is the only possible answer to the fact of individual differences in ability and in aspirations—it is the only means of achieving quality within a framework of quantity."[4]

Gardner illustrates what he means by institutional excellence with his now famous "Princeton fable." I cannot resist quoting it:

> The traditionalist might say, "Of course! Let Princeton create a junior college and one would have an institution of unquestionable excellence!" That may be correct, but it leads us down precisely the wrong path. If Princeton Junior College were excellent in the sense that Princeton University is excellent, it might not be excellent in the most important way that a community college can be excellent. It would simply be a truncated version of Princeton University. A comparably meaningless result would be achieved if General Motors tried to add to its line of low priced cars by marketing the front half of a Cadillac.[5]

Another aspect of excellence—individual excellences—is germane to our discussion. A brief quote from the Rockefeller Report is self-explanatory.

> There is no single scale or simple set of categories in terms of which to measure excellence. There is excellence in abstract intellectual activity, in art, in music, in managerial activities, in craftsmanship, in human relations, in technical work. . . . We must recognize (the Report concludes) that judgments of differences in talent are not judgments of differences in human worth.[6]

As a product of the twentieth century, the junior college is not bound by tradition. Given reasonable time for planning and organization, it can provide educational experiences recommended by lay advisory committees with relative ease. A junior college president, speaking to my class recently, illustrated this very point in these words:

---

[4] John Gardner, "Quality in Higher Education," *Current Issues in Higher Education*, 1958, National Education Association, Washington, D.C., 1958, p. 11.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 11.

[6] *The Pursuit of Excellence: Education and the Future of America*, Special Studies Project Report V, Rockefeller Brothers Fund, Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, 1958, p. 16-17.

> We serve three communities on our eighty-three acre campus. Their requests for educational services are directed to the district Board of Trustees. They and they alone make the decisions.

Community leaders may not have read the latest book on curriculum development. They may not realize that weekend course requests cannot properly be placed on next week's course schedule. Community college administrators, however, must be able to cope with sudden requests. At this point, the community junior college is put to a severe test; to serve community needs, however humble the activity, but at the same time to maintain quality in all that it undertakes.

Again, in Gardner's words:

> Here again we must recognize that there may be excellence or shoddiness in every line of human endeavor. We must learn to honor excellence (indeed to demand it) in every socially accepted human activity, however humble the activity, and to scorn shoddiness however exalted the activity. There may be excellent plumbers and incompetent plumbers, excellent philosophers and incompetent philosophers. An excellent plumber is infinitely more admirable than an incompetent philosopher. The society which scorns excellence in plumbing because plumbing is a humble activity and tolerates shoddiness in philosophy because it is an exalted activity will have neither good plumbing nor good philosophy. Neither its pipes nor its theories will hold water.[7]

Local control of public education is a long established national pattern. Education—a clear responsibility of the states—is, according to this fundamental pattern, delegated to the people, who in the case of public junior colleeges, elect boards of trustees. Orderly development of this cherished system, including substantial financial support and fiscal control, is a vital necessity. Local autonomy, in Johnson's words, is necessary "to the encouragement of the creative initiative which is essential for the optimum development of vital and effective junior colleges."[8]

The community-junior college, emerging as a twentieth century product of this nation, is thus known for its great diversity, its capability of unique flexibility, and above all, its service to a specific community.

---

[7] Gardner, *op. cit.*, p. 13.

[8] B. Lamar Johnson, *State Junior Colleges: How Can They Function Effectively?* Atlanta, Georgia: Southern Regional Education Board, 1965, Chapter II.

Nine Propositions

1. *The community-junior college should be open—and free to most —to all who may profit from work provided.* The dilemma of the "open door" felt by two-year colleges in many states—certainly California—is a topic for discussion whenever and wherever junior college people gather.

What about the "open door?" Is it a "wide open door," a "partially open door," a "revolving door?" These and other directly related issues, such as financing, staffing and the problem of status for the institution which happens to believe in the "open door," are constantly debated. The fact remains, however, community colleges are obliged —required in California—to admit practically all comers. They are charged with the heavy responsibility of doing something with all those who ask for the opportunity to try post high school education.

The "open door" philosophy of community college education is not uniformly accepted. In the September, 1965 *California Junior College Association Faculty Association Bulletin,* John Palmer and John Dowden, editors, contribute opposing editorials which succinctly state the case of the open door. According to Palmer, higher education is a privilege, not a right. He urges higher admissions and retention standards, as recently recommended by the California Coordinating Council for Higher Education, and tuition to protect educational resources and tax-payers' dollars. Dowden, on the other hand, writes that in a democracy, a college education should be for the many, "not just for the intellectually and economically privileged few."

More institutions than one might realize actually follow an open door policy. Schenz, in a study of what junior colleges are doing about low ability students, found that four out of five of those enrolling 400 or more admit any high school graduate. Almost half of these admit all those over eighteen who can profit from instruction given.[9] There is, however, ample evidence to suggest that many institutions who reputedly maintain open-door admissions restrict enrollment in so-called transfer courses and enforce tighter probationary standards. Those which have only limited facilities for technical-vocational pro-

---

[9] Robert F. Schenz, *An Investigation of Junior College Courses and Curricula for Students with Low Ability,* Unpublished Doctor of Education Dissertation, Los Angeles, University of California, 1963, p. 44.

grams frequently have no other choice than to admit students according to aptitude.

Is the answer, then, the partially open door, or is the "revolving door" a reasonable solution? Medsker adds a sense of urgency to the open-door dilemma when he writes:

> We can be reasonably sure that if an institution such as the junior college does not serve them, the public will insist that some other agency be created to give them the necessary transitional experience from school to active participation in normal adult activities. Assuming we close the door slightly (Medsker asks) how do we know how far to close it before the college will cease to exert its maximum motivating influence in its community?[10]

2. *The community-junior college should maintain strong guidance services to assist each student to find a course of study appropriate to his abilities.* For the open-door college this responsibility is enormous. There is ample evidence to confirm the complexity and seriousness of the task. Medsker's study reveals, for example, that approximately two-thirds of all those who enter junior colleges expect to graduate from a senior college or university. They aspire, frequently under parental pressure, to careers in prestige professions (medicine, law, engineering) for which they typically possess meager aptitude. Many are doomed to failure before they start. Only about one-third actually make it beyond the first two years provided by junior colleges.[11]

What can be done for the student who is doomed to failure? We are referring to the latent-terminal who will complete his educational efforts at the junior college. Clark suggests a "cooling-out" technique for junior college guidance personnel which illustrates the need for skilled and experienced people. This device he borrows from the field of psychiatry and from the gambling table:

> The latent terminal student (he explains) is allowed into transfer curricula but encounters counseling and testing that invite him to consider alternatives, subtle pressures to hedge his bet by taking courses that serve a terminal destiny, tough talk in orientation classes about realistic occupational choice, probationary status perhaps, and

---

[10] Leland L. Medsker, "The Junior College—A Powerful Motivating Force for Educational Advantage," Washington: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1961, p. 11.

[11] Leland L. Medsker, *The Junior College Progress and Prospect,* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960, p. 24.

finally grades that will not allow transferring. He can be let down gradually, in what can be interpreted as a process of gentle stalling.[12]

This subtle system of "tapering out" those who are doomed to failure can be developed most effectively in junior colleges which profess to specialize in personalized attention.

It is clear that the open-door college desperately needs well-trained guidance personnel as well as instructors who are dedicated to the individual student. Both, I firmly believe, are vital to a complete program. One is not an adequate substitute for the other. Both are necessary to maintain a personalized guidance program.

The Raines study, *Project for Appraisal and Development of Student Personnel Services,* completed in November, 1965, reports facts regarding widespread weaknesses of junior college student personnel services. This nationwide survey of 123 randomly chosen junior colleges revealed that:

a. Three-fourths of community colleges studied have inadequate student personnel programs.
b. Less than half provide adequate guidance and counseling.
c. Few offer students adequate occupational information.
d. Of all the functions of a student personnel program, least effective is the upgrading of staff members—coordination and evaluation of this effort.
e. Few colleges studied offer badly needed community guidance centers.
f. Student personnel administrators are not well-prepared professionally.
g. Current staffing is very inadequate both quantitatively and qualitatively.[13]

Dr. Raines and his research associates recommend a nationwide crash program, including (1) a stepped-up program of counselors, (2) a program of field consultants to junior colleges, (3) demonstration centers in junior colleges with the strongest student personnel programs, and (4) centralized coordination at the national, regional and state levels.[14]

---

[12] Burton R. Clark, *The Open Door College,* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960, p. 162-163.
[13] Max R. Raines, *et al., Junior College Student Personnel Programs,* Washington: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1965.
[14] Max R. Raines, *The Student Personnel Situation, Junior College Journal,* 36:5, February, 1966, p. 8.

Dr. Jane E. Matson, Professor of Education and Coordinator of the Junior College Counselor Training Program at California State College at Los Angeles, has recently been appointed to the staff of the American Association of Junior Colleges to implement recommendations of the Raines report. Commenting on the crucial need for strengthening junior college student personnel programs, Dr. Matson concludes:

> There is considerable evidence that student personnel programs have not yet achieved the level of effectiveness necessary if the broadening mission of the junior college is to be successful. In fact, there are those who believe that the ultimate success in meeting the challenges which face the junior college in the coming decade depends upon the quality of the student personnel services provided. Steps must be taken quickly to improve the implementation of the college functions related to the student personnel area.[15]

3. *The community-junior college should offer sound technical-vocational curricula realistic to community requirements and commensurate with its own ability to do so.* The two-year college can, and indeed must, assume major responsibility for the training of semiprofessional, technical personnel. Recent publications by Venn and Harris, as well as articles in the *Junior College Journal,* highlight the urgency for post high school occupational training and admonish junior college leaders to accept the responsibility to "run with the ball." To do the job, in Venn's words, "will take more than the wishing of concerned educators. . . ." "Indeed," Venn continues, "the failure of the two-year college to assume the major responsibility for occupational education beyond the high school will mean that this necessary societal function will be performed through educationally less desirable avenues, such as area skills centers or Federal crash programs of manpower training. This has, in fact, already begun to occur."[16]

There is growing evidence of a rather convincing character that community junior colleges in every corner of the country must increase efforts to provide the nation with well-trained semiprofessionals. While many are strengthening occupational programs, such increased attention to occupational curricula, taken the country over, is

---

[15] Jane E. Matson, "Emphasis-Follow-up on the Student Personnel Project," *Junior College Journal,* 37:1, September, 1966, p. 3.

[16] Grant Venn, *Man, Education and Work,* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1964, p. 89.

not uniformly recognized. By one count, California provides 334 such programs; seven states, however, provide no opportunities. Over 80 per cent of students enrolled in junior college occupational curricula are found in California, New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois and Michigan.[17]

Community-junior colleges are thus expected by many to occupy a leadership role in providing excellently educated technicians and semi-professionals. Why? Because, we submit, this institution is in the best position to offer a balanced educational opportunity, including skills of reading, writing, listening, and computing, essential to enable each student "to move into his next role in life, whether this be further study, either academic or occupational, or direct entry into the work world."[18] This balance must be developed and maintained by the individual institution. The Associate in Arts degree awarded to those who successfully complete a balanced curriculum is the accepted vehicle. Courses in the student's major field of specialization are intended to provide him with sufficient background to later employment, while courses in other study areas will provide the broadening experiences necessary for his proper participation in the community and to accommodate to change in his particular technical specialty.

Flexibility should be a second basic characteristic of future semi-professional curricula. Today's new skill becomes old tomorrow with the speed of technological improvements. Flexible admission policies, personalized counseling, location convenience, and low cost, all characteristic of the community-junior college, are additional reasons why we think this institution should play a leadership role in semi-professional education.

A word of warning: an institution must be exceedingly careful to avoid announcing technical-vocational classes which it is not prepared to offer, or for which there is little community need. The citizen's advisory committee acts not only as a community sounding board but also provides, in many instances, vital technical assistance.

4. *The community-junior college should continue to offer strong lower division programs.* Lower division education is the traditional responsibility of the junior college. Under the academic banner, it is the most prestigious of all responsibilities. Instructors brought up in

[17] *Ibid.*, p. 89.
[18] *Ibid.*, p. 169.

the university academic community, feel at home with the traditional classroom methodology which they experienced as students, and enjoy working with "their kind" of people. It is all too easy for them to take orders from, or better, to rely on the judgments of senior colleges and universities which traditionally accept or reject work given at two-year colleges. To become, in other words, a junior university is all too convenient. When this happens the junior college, in Medsker's words, "forfeits its identity and its opportunity to experiment in the development of a program most appropriate for it.[19]

The problem of course articulation between two-year and four-year institutions has eased considerably in recent years. Although pockets of high handedness and resentment persist, both parties, in all sections of the country, are recognizing that community-junior colleges are soon to enroll the great majority of freshmen and sophomores. In California, where community-junior colleges have had their greatest development, this has already occurred. Even in 1963, California public junior colleges had 80.1 per cent of all freshmen, 65.9 per cent of all sophomores, and 83.7 per cent of all unclassified students (adults and other part time).[20] By July 1, 1967 all California public school districts must be in a junior college district. Nearly all residents of Florida, Illinois, New York and New Jersey, among a growing number of states, are now within commuting distance of a community college.

Professional educators, particularly admissions officers and registrars, have long been engaged in articulation activities to improve student transfer from one segment of public education to another. In most states, such efforts have, until recently, been limited to high school-senior college articulation. Agreements between two- and four-year colleges, given priority attention because of the junior college's explosive growth, are just now appearing. With the creation in 1958 of a Joint Committee on Junior and Senior Colleges combining members of the American Association of Junior Colleges, Association of American Colleges and American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers, two- and four-year college articulation efforts begin to receive serious attention on a nationwide basis.

California and Florida, as the Knoell-Medsker study indicates, are

---

[19] Medsker, *Op. cit.*, p. 53.

[20] Daniel B. Milliken, *Prosperity in California and the Role Played by Community Junior Colleges* (Chaffey College Monograph), 1963.

both well ahead of other states in the development of such machinery for improving both high school-four-year college and two- and four-year college articulation. In both states major attention is given to curricular and instructional problems in general eduction, engineering, business administration and foreign languages. Ad hoc committees made up of subject-matter specialists operate effectively to establish and improve communication and solve specific transfer situations.[21]

Articulation agreements which involve groups of junior and senior colleges are close to reality in the Los Angeles metropolitan area. Where one-to-one agreements may only compound the junior college problem, a group approach holds much promise. In the words of Dr. Albert Caliguiri, College Curriculum Coordinator, Los Angeles City Schools, "The foundation is now laid for the development of more universal agreements on general education transferability."

Junior college administrators are understandably pressing for an across-the-board junior standing for their graduates. Their course patterns, it is true, must parallel lower division requirements of many senior institutions—an unreasonable, if not an impossible position. The State of Florida has taken the longest step toward what junior college leaders would feel is an ideal system. A statement prepared by the Florida State Department of Education and issued under the title "Policies for transferring students among Florida's Public Institutions of Higher Learning," sets the basic formula:

> Junior college transfers shall be considered as having met the general education requirements of the receiving senior institution if the junior college has certified that the student has completed the lower division general education requirements of the junior college transfers, both graduates and non-graduates.

Certain questions would necessarily have to be answered, if such a plan would aid rather than hinder transfer students. Among these are the following:

1. Are transfer students uniformly prepared for upper division work?
   A. What statewide criteria or standards guide junior college general education patterns?

---

[21] Dorothy M. Knoell and Leland L. Medsker, *Factors Affecting Performance of Transfer Students from Two- to Four-year Colleges: with Implications for Coordination and Articulation,* Berkeley: University of California, 1964, p. 173.

B. Where course titles are similar, is content reasonably standardized among the state's junior colleges?

2. Are transfer students realistically prepared for upper division courses?
   A. Can junior college transfers compete with their University counterparts in specialized major field courses?
   (On the California scene, the University answers "yes" to all of the questions.)
3. Is maximum cooperation assured from both two- and four-year college facilities?

The Florida plan is innovative and daring. Success of this experimental program rests, of course, on the achievements of its junior college transfers as compared to University native students. Initial success and persistence reports will be carefully studied.

While reforms in other states, including California, may not follow the Florida pattern, liberalization of transfer credit for advanced standing is inevitable. Such freedom would, in Thornton's words, "not only assure the senior college and university of the seriousness of purpose and the ability of its transfer students, it would also free the junior college to concentrate on a high quality of achievement in all its offerings, even though the exact course outlines of some university courses were not closely paralleled anywhere in the curriculum."[22] Cooperation among all institutions responsible for higher education is, again, the only direction.

The best sources to indicate the success of university-junior college articulation are comments which former junior college students exchange with junior college counselors who come to visit them at the University. Junior college counselors and admissions officers most frequently report to us that:

1. Junior college transfers note the severity of competition for grades.
2. Former junior college students frequently mention the great amount of reading necessary in University courses.
3. They further say that they experience more essay-type examination questions at the University.
4. At the University, they feel a greater independence and responsibility for their own educational progress.

---

[22] James W. Thornton, *The Community-Junior College*, New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1960, p. 217.

5. After transferring to the University, junior college transfer students frequently confess that they miss the close relationships with instructors, personalized instruction, and the friendly, informal atmosphere characteristic of junior colleges.
6. Former junior college students invariably have a rather good comprehension of the multiple functions of the junior college.

How do transfer students compare with native students in grade point average and persistence? This question continues to entice researchers. Hills reported recently on an examination of between twenty and thirty such studies of groups dating from 1922 to the present. He generalizes that the transfer student usually experiences what he calls a "transfer shock"—a drop in grades for the first term of senior college work; that he recovers gradually in succeeding semesters, but at the point of graduation remains somewhat below his native student counterpart. Hills further asserts that the junior college transfer "will be less likely to survive to graduate from the four-year college than if he were native, and it will probably take him longer. . . ."[23]

Findings of the Knoell-Medsker research, a comprehensive and detailed study of approximately 7,200 former junior college students who attended senior colleges and universities located in ten states, tend to support Hills' generalizations on success patterns at various institutions (the "transfer shock," the gradual recovery). They point out, however, that grade point achievement differences between junior college transfers and native students at the point of graduation are only slight. Regarding persistence, Knoell-Medsker report that transfers were "just as efficient (as natives) in the total numbers of semesters attended and units earned in satisfaction of baccalaureate degree requirements."[24] Junior colleges, Knoell and Medsker conclude, "are now providing an important avenue to the attainment of the baccalaureate degree for many students who would not otherwise be able to undertake such programs."[25] Athough he views the junior college with considerable caution, Hills agrees, in effect, when he states, that:

> . . . while fewer transfers than natives may graduate, still many of the transfers do eventually graduate with four year degrees, the trans-

[23] John R. Hills, "Transfer Shock: The Academic Performance of the Junior College Transfer," *The Journal of Experimental Education*, 33:201-215, Spring, 1965, p. 209.
[24] Dorothy M. Knoell and Leland L. Medsker, *Op. cit.*, p. 180.
[25] *Ibid.*, p. 184.

> fer function of junior colleges is by no means wasted. There are probably many students who do not have the freedom to choose between entering a junior college and transferring as opposed to entering a four-year institution directly. . . . There can be no question of the value to society of making higher education available to people who could not otherwise take advantage of it.[26]

Generalizations drawn from student success and persistence in disparate institutions have limited value for our discussion. University admission standards which affect advanced standing selection as well as freshman admission is only one limiting factor. Particularized studies would, I suspect, be more significant.

The "transfer shock" and subsequent academic improvement are again borne out in a recently completed study of 2,600 UCLA entrants. A group of approximately 1,800 freshmen entering in 1960 was contrasted with some 800 students transferring in 1962 from California public junior colleges. Entering with a 2.85 grade point average, transfers, after one University semester dropped to 2.35. After three semesters, however, the group had improved to a 2.63 average.

Grade point differences between the two groups progressively diminish each succeeding semester—.34, .26, and .15, respectively. While the study was not carried to graduation, it appears that the groups at that point would likely be separated by less than one tenth of a grade. It should be further noted that students ineligible because of inadequate high school grades are represented in the transfer group, giving added support to the quality of California public junior colleges in terms of success of its students at UCLA.

How do transfer students evaluate their junior college experiences? A high percentage asked this question during the Knoell-Medsker study indicated that they would have a second time chosen a junior college over a senior institution. Less than 2 per cent reported general dissatisfaction with their junior college experiences.

5. *The community-junior college should require a minimum program of general education of all degree or certificate candidates regardless of major interest.*This calls for the establishment of core courses to serve the entire student body: those students who are still searching for a major field interest, those who plan to terminate post-high

[26] Hills, *Op. cit.*, p. 210.

school education after one or two years in a junior college and therefore elect a variety of classes for general enrichment, those who are meeting general education requirements associated with the baccalaureate degree, and those who are majoring in semi-professional curricula.

Most educators see the two types of education, general and special, working together to develop men with highly trained technical skills, but with the capacity to relate their knowledge to daily living. They recommend a balance between the two so that students are throughly trained as specialists but still are acquainted with some of the basic areas of human wisdom. Many recommend, for example, that technical-vocational majors be required to spend about one-fourth to one-third of their classroom time in general education courses. English, history, speech, political science, psychology, and physical education are typical requirements. In the words of one junior college president, "Industry wants it that way. Employers these days want us to turn out broadly educated graduates." Los Angeles Trade-Technical College, one of the largest and most important junior colleges specializing in semi-professional training, currently requires every student regardless of his technical major to take one academic class per semester.

In its finest development, then, "the two-year college (in Johnson's words) demonstrates the validity of an educational program which is limited neither to vocational education nor to general education but which rather combines in a single institution offerings that prepare students both to earn a livelihood and assume their common responsibilities in citizenship and adult living."[27] Education in preparation for life and education for a livelihood are indeed inseparable. We are actually describing a single vital process.

6. *The community-junior college should serve its entire community.* The community college has as a major purpose—its newest objective —Community Services. The term "community" within the last decade has been added to official titles of two-year institutions across the country. " 'Community' connotes a close interrelationship of the college and the life of the community; the college looks to the community for suggestions in program-planning and the community looks to

[27] B. Lamar Johnson, "Is the Junior College Idea Useful for Other Countries?" *Junior College Journal,* 32:3-8, September, 1961, p. 6.

the college for many different services to many different people."[28] Community services is specifically defined by Reynolds as involving "both college and community resources and conducted for the purpose of meeting specified educational needs of individuals or enterprises within the college or the community. From this viewpoint community services are provided through an extension of the regular school program in terms of the traditional school day, the traditional locations of the instructional activities, the traditional curriculum, and the traditional concept of students."[29]

Included in this description are not only courses and services offered under the traditional rubric, adult-education, but also other services which Harlacher calls specialized community services.[30] What are these services? Section C of Harlacher's recently completed dissertation: "Survey of Critical Incidents in the Establishment and Supervision of Junior Community Services," identifies four broad areas: (1) community use of college facilities, (2) educational services for the community, (3) cultural and recreational services, and (4) public relations.

In addition to the obligation to meet the needs of the districts which support them, junior colleges also respond to industrial requirements of the surrounding region. Forestry Technology is emphasized by several colleges in western Washington; Agriculture Technology, by central California colleges in the San Joaquin Valley; Oil Technology, by two-year colleges in the great Texas oil fields; Apparel Design in New York City; Banking in the Greater Chicago Area. Increasingly, groups of junior colleges are adapting curricula to the economy of a region, and in some instances are dividing training responsibilities to meet area manpower needs.

7. *The community-junior college should provide remedial courses for those whose education is inadequate for making a livelihood.* The open-door college, by virtue of its interest in every student who seeks the opportunity to prove that he can do successful collegiate work frequently serves as an "opportunity college" for those of low ability.

---

[28] Medsker, *Op. cit.*, p. 16.

[29] James W. Reynolds, "Community Services," *The Public Junior College*, National Society for the Study of Education, Fifty-fifth Yearbook, Part I, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956, p. 142.

[30] Ervin L. Harlacher, "California's Community Renaissance," *Junior College Journal*, 34: April, 1964.

The dilemma of the open-door is thus compounded. Questions regarding length of stay and level of course difficulty are added to the original issue of who may attend. Is change in educational objective justification enough to allow a second, third, or fourth chance? How many levels of subcollegiate English, for example, can we afford to offer? Do we have trained personnel to handle an adult version of seventh grade mathematics?

Staffing is, indeed, a major problem for the "opportunity college." "Some faculty members (Lombardi observes) are not sympathetic to the introduction of remedial courses. They openly advocate eliminating the 'obvious illiterates' and dropping the 'untouchables.' They fear that poor students will lower academic standards."[31] These critics —and there are some on every campus—relegate to second-class citizenry those who teach such classes. Maintaining faculty interest is a constant administrative problem.

There is evidence, however, that realistic progress is being made. Schenz reports that "the vast majority of the public colleges which support the open-door policy of admissions also recommended the provision of special courses and curricula for students of low ability."[32]

For a quite different type of student, the public junior college is increasingly obliged to provide a second chance—the potentially top performer who didn't make it the first time at the senior college or university. Confronted with a growing army of university "dropdowns," each community college must answer additional questions: Should such applicants be placed on probation—programs restricted? What special conditions should characterize the contract made with students who seek this kind of second chance?

It is here that the comprehensive public community college has the opportunity to make its greatest contribution—to personalize educational opportunity. Because of its responsibilities for lower division preparation or occupational training, it has learned to be tough minded; but through its close community bonds and secondary school background, it has an inherent capacity for tender heartedness.[33]

---

[31] John Lombardi, "Emergent Issues in Administration," *Junior College Journal,* 35:5, November, 1964

[32] Schenz, *Op. cit.,* p. 152.

[33] Frederick C. Kintzer, "Admission of Students to California Public Junior Colleges who are in Academic Difficulty at the University of California," *College and University,* 41:2, Winter 1966, p. 230.

8. *The community-junior college should develop viable programs of institutional research with particular emphasis upon the teaching process and student success.* Flexibility is one of the distinctive characteristics of the two-year college. If it is to retain its ability to repsond rapidly and with sensitivity to community needs, it must remain in fluid drive. The junior college must somehow keep ahead of its decisions. An active, alert institutional research arm is obviously necessary, if the dynamic energies of an institution are to be realistically implemented.

What type of research is institutional research? What kind will yield biggest dividends? The *California Master Plan for Higher Education* provides a defensible recommendation:

> The junior colleges will consider themselves instructional institutions with work confined to the lower division; hence, research should be directed toward improving instruction.[34]

Are junior colleges engaging in institutional research? If so, what are points of emphases? Johnson, in a survey of institutional research in one hundred Western junior colleges found in part that:

1. Junior colleges engage in considerable institutional research.
2. The amount of institutional research varies widely from college to college, with more than one-fourth of the colleges reporting "little research."
3. Less than one-third of the colleges have even part-time coordinators of research. Many—and apparently most—two-year colleges give only casual attention to the organization for and conduct of institutional research.
4. Both the quality of research and the effectiveness of reporting varies widely from college to college. In all too many colleges the quality of research is distinctly inferior.[35]

An additional finding reported by Dr. Johnson, is, in view of the teaching role of the junior college, most revealing. The largest number of studies included in his survey dealt with students (almost 50 per cent of the total) while none of the 111 studies were focused on the teaching process. This casts an ominous tone. The community-ju-

---

[34] Master Plan Survey Team, *A Master Plan for Highre Education in California, 1960-1975,* California State Department of Education, 1960, p. 210.

[35] B. Lamar Johnson, "Institutional Research in the Junior Colleges of Western States," *Institutional Research in the Junior College,* Occasional Report No. 3 from UCLA Junior College Leadership Program, Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles, 1962, p. 26.

nior college cannot for long maintain its reputation for superior instruction if it continues to give only casual attention to evaluation of its basic charge.

9. *The community-junior college is recognized as a teaching institution. This characteristic—which at best sets it apart from other institutions of higher learning—should indeed be developed to the fullest.*

Any development which threatens the effectiveness of this basic and unique characteristic of junior college education must be carefully considered. Academic rank, emphasis upon scholarly research, tightened academic standards, and a University-oriented curriculum have questionable appropriateness for the junior college.

For purposes of our discussion, Tillery succinctly outlines the issue:

> The roles of the college professor and his subordinates in rank are well established and understood in higher education. The status of research and scholarship, the dictum of "publish or perish," and the emphasis on academic standards and curriculum for an intellectual elite are increasingly characteristic of university and four-year college models. However appropriate these demands and values may be for senior and graduate education, they are in conflict with the teaching, guidance, and service functions of the junior college.[36]

Faculty involvement in policy making, another area receiving considerable attention in junior colleges the country over, is also related to the academic rank question. Suffice it to say, determination of faculty responsibilities in formation and enforcement of institutional policy must be consistent with the philosophy of junior college education and specific objectives of the particular institution.

Yes, the community-junior college must, above all else, maintain high quality instruction. Excellence has become a key word in our society.

We have proposed a philosophy—a rationale—for the community-junior college:

1. An expanded free education for an expanding citizenry;
2. Greater diversity and flexibility in education to achieve the enormous task—each segment excellent in itself,
3. Effective organization and substantial financial support at the local level.

---

[36] Dale Tillery, "Academic Rank: Promise or Peril," *Junior College Journal*, 33: 6-9, February, 1963.

We then reviewed nine propositions suggesting that the community-junior college should:

1. Be open—and free to most—to all who may profit from work provided,
2. Maintain strong guidance services to assist each student to find a course of study appropriate to his abilities and aspirations,
3. Offer sound technical-vocational curricula realistic to community requirements and commensurate with its own ability to do so,
4. Continue to offer strong imaginative lower-division programs for transfer students,
5. Require a minimum program of general education of all degree or certificate candidates regardless of major interest,
6. Serve its entire community,
7. Provide remedial courses for those whose education is inadequate for making a livelihood or for living successfully in our society,
8. Develop viable programs of institutional research with particular emphasis upon the teaching process and student success, and
9. Develop to the fullest its reputation as a teaching institution.

The multipurpose community-junior college with an open door to all who may profit is now assuming a leadership role in the immediate post-high school educational picture. I want to conclude with one basic consideration regarding this leadership—that the genius of the community-junior college is its ability to provide *on one campus* opportunities for academic degree-bound students; opportunities for those who show an interest in and an aptitude for semi-professional or trade training; for students wishing to continue in general studies for at least two years past high school; and for adults in the local area who want cultural, recreational, and vocational classes. Quality programs for a diversified student body must, in essence, be the prime objective of the ideal community-junior college.